

**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

In re:

Zohar III, Corp., *et al.*,¹

Debtors.

Chapter 11

Case No. 18-10512 (KBO)

Jointly Administered

ZOHAR CDO 2003-1, LIMITED; ZOHAR II
2005-1, LIMITED; and ZOHAR III, LIMITED,

Plaintiffs,

-against-

PATRIARCH PARTNERS, LLC;
PATRIARCH PARTNERS VIII, LLC;
PATRIARCH PARTNERS XIV, LLC;
PATRIARCH PARTNERS XV, LLC;
PHOENIX VIII, LLC; OCTALUNA LLC;
OCTALUNA II LLC; OCTALUNA III LLC;
ARK II CLO 2001-1, LLC; ARK
INVESTMENT PARTNERS II, LP; ARK
ANGELS VII, LLC; PATRIARCH PARTNERS
MANAGEMENT GROUP, LLC; PATRIARCH
PARTNERS AGENCY SERVICES, LLC; and
LYNN TILTON,

Defendants.

Adversary No. 20-50534 (KBO)

**REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IN CONNECTION WITH DEFENDANTS’
MOTION TO DISMISS THE COMPLAINT**

¹ The “Debtors,” and, where applicable, the last four digits of their taxpayer identification number are as follows: Zohar III, Corp. (9612), Zohar II 2005-1, Corp. (4059), Zohar CDO 2003-1, Corp. (3724), Zohar III, Limited (“Zohar III”) (9261), Zohar II 2005-1, Limited (“Zohar II”) (8297), and Zohar CDO 2003-1, Limited (together with Zohar II and Zohar III, the “Zohar Funds”) (5119). The Debtors’ address is 3 Times Square, c/o FTI Consulting, Inc., New York, NY 10036.

Pursuant to Rule 7007-3 of the Local Rules of Bankruptcy Practice and Procedure of the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware, defendants Patriarch Partners, LLC; Patriarch Partners VIII, LLC; Patriarch Partners XIV, LLC; Patriarch Partners XV, LLC; Phoenix VIII, LLC; Octaluna LLC; Octaluna II LLC; Octaluna III LLC; Ark II CLO 2001-1, LLC; Ark Investment Partners II, LP; Ark Angels VII, LLC; Patriarch Partners Management Group, LLC; Patriarch Partners Agency Services, LLC; and Lynn Tilton (collectively, the “Defendants”), by and through their counsel, respectfully submit this request for oral argument in connection with the *Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss the Complaint* [Adv. D.I. 43], and all related filings (including Adv. D.I. 43, 44, 45, 59, and 95, collectively, the “Motion to Dismiss”).

The Defendants respectfully submit that oral argument is appropriate because the Motion to Dismiss presents numerous complex and substantial legal issues. Oral argument would allow the parties to clarify any points raised in the Motion to Dismiss should the Court have questions.

Dated: December 23, 2020

COLE SCHOTZ P.C.

By: /s/ Patrick J. Reilley

Norman L. Pernick (No. 2290)

G. David Dean (No. 6403)

Patrick J. Reilley (No. 4451)

500 Delaware Avenue, Suite 1410

Wilmington, DE 19801

Telephone: (302) 652-3131

Facsimile: (302) 652-3117

npernick@coleschotz.com

ddean@coleschotz.com

preilley@coleschotz.com

– and –

SHER TREMONTE LLP

Theresa Trzaskoma (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)

Michael Tremonte (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)

Justin J. Gunnell (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)

Vikram Shah (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)

90 Broad Street, 23rd Floor

New York, New York 10004

Telephone: (212) 202-2600

Facsimile: (212) 202-4156

ttrzaskoma@shertremonte.com

mtremonte@shertremonte.com

jgunnell@shertremonte.com

vshah@shertremonte.com

Counsel to Lynn Tilton, Patriarch Partners, LLC, Patriarch Partners VIII, LLC, Patriarch Partners XIV, LLC, Patriarch Partners XV, LLC, Phoenix VIII, LLC, Octaluna LLC, Octaluna II LLC, Octaluna III LLC, Ark II CLO 2001-1, LLC, Ark Investment Partners II, LP, Ark Angels VII, LLC, Patriarch Partners Management Group, LLC, and Patriarch Partners Agency Services, LLC